

QUALITY REPORT

Co2 Carbon reforestación Arcos de la Frontera

CM-26fe64 · MITECO · Spain

Report ID: CM-3942B0CC · Generated: 2026-04-02 · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0

3.2 Overall Score out of 10	■ Integrity (35%)	1.3
	■ Transparency (25%)	4.2
	■ Claim Safety (25%)	3.6
	■ Documentation (15%)	5.4

Weights: Integrity 35% · Transparency 25% · Claim Safety 25% · Documentation 15%

Assessment Summary

The project has some basic documentation (PDD, validation report, and a 2024 monitoring report), but key carbon-accounting elements are not stated in the extracted record. Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence risk management are not evidenced with quantified parameters, which increases over-crediting risk. CORSIA is explicitly not applicable, which slightly reduces downstream double-claim risk, but CCP status is not stated.

Project Details

Registry	MITECO
Registry ID	CM-26fe64
Sector	arr
Country	Spain
Vintage	2024
VVB	Valvanera Ulargui Aparicio
Confidence	High
Documents Reviewed	3 documents reviewed
Scored	2026-04-02

Red Flags

- Baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are not stated in the extracted record, limiting confidence in credited removals.
- No leakage deduction or leakage justification is found in the extracted record for an ARR/reforestation activity.
- No permanence risk management details (buffer pool contribution or reversal monitoring outcomes) are found in the extracted record.
- Safeguards (FPIC, grievance mechanism, benefit sharing) are not evidenced in the extracted record.
- Leakage not addressed in project documentation
- Buffer pool size not disclosed in available documents

Score Breakdown

Integrity — 1.3 / 10

- Additionality, baseline approach, leakage treatment, and permanence provisions (e.g., buffer pool) are not stated in the extracted record across the PDD/validation/monitoring documents.

~ The monitoring report (2024-09-19) reports no material findings and no corrective actions, but this does not substitute for missing quantified accounting parameters.

Across the PDD, validation report, and the monitoring report (2024-09-19), the extracted record does not state the additionality test used or whether additionality was confirmed by the validator. The baseline method and any baseline reassessment timing are also not found in the extracted record, making it hard to judge whether credited removals are conservative. Leakage is not evidenced (no deduction percentage and no justification found), and permanence risk management is unclear because no buffer pool contribution or reversal information is found in the extracted record.

Transparency — 4.2 / 10

+ Core document set is present (PDD, validation report, monitoring report dated 2024-09-19).

- Monitoring period and verified vs claimed removals are not stated in the extracted record, limiting MRV transparency.

The project has a basic public-facing documentation trail in the extracted record (PDD, validation report, and a monitoring report dated 2024-09-19), which supports some transparency. However, the monitoring period is not stated, and neither claimed nor verified total removals are found in the extracted record, preventing cross-checks between monitoring and verification outcomes. The validator name is provided, but the MRV quantification details needed to replicate results are not evidenced here.

Claim Safety — 3.6 / 10

+ The project is explicitly not CORSIA-eligible, reducing one pathway for high-risk claims.

- Over-crediting risk is elevated because baseline method, leakage approach, and verified removals are not stated in the extracted record.

CORSIA eligibility is explicitly marked as false, which reduces the risk of high-impact aviation claims. Nonetheless, the extracted record does not provide the baseline method, leakage treatment, or verified removals totals, which increases the risk that credits could be used for claims that overstate climate benefit. CCP status is not stated in the extracted record, so buyers cannot easily benchmark the project against ICVCM expectations.

Documentation — 5.4 / 10

+ Three key document types are available (PDD, validation report, monitoring report) with medium extraction confidence.

- Several critical fields are missing or not evidenced (crediting/monitoring periods, accounting methodology/version, safeguards), indicating incomplete extractable documentation.

The evidence set includes a PDD, validation report, and a monitoring report (2024-09-19), and the minimum extraction confidence is medium, suggesting the documents were at least partially readable. Even so, many critical quantitative and procedural elements are not found in the extracted record (methodology/version, monitoring period, crediting period, claimed/verified totals, leakage and permanence provisions). Safeguards are not evidenced: FPIC, grievance mechanism, and benefit sharing are all not indicated in the extracted record.

Risk Indicators

● Additionality	Additionality not evidenced
● Permanence	Permanence provisions not evidenced
● Leakage	Leakage not evidenced
● Baseline	Baseline method not stated
● Safeguards	Safeguards not evidenced
● Double-claim	Not CORSIA; CCP not stated

What Would Improve This Score

→ Publish (or extract clearly) the carbon accounting methodology and version, baseline approach, monitoring period, and the claimed vs verified removal totals for the latest issuance/monitoring cycle.

→ Document permanence risk management (e.g., buffer pool contribution, reversal monitoring and response procedures) and provide a quantified leakage assessment with justification (even if concluded negligible).

Documents Reviewed

- Monitoring Report
- Project Design Document (PDD)
- Validation / Verification Report

Disclaimer

This Quality Report is an independent editorial assessment generated by CarbonMeld's automated analysis pipeline. It is based solely on publicly available registry documents and marketplace metadata at the time of analysis.

CarbonMeld does not have access to non-public project information, internal project documentation, or confidential communications with project developers. The analysis pipeline may not have retrieved all publicly available documents for this project.

This report does not constitute an audit, certification, financial recommendation, investment advice, or guarantee of environmental outcome. It does not replace professional due diligence by the buyer or any party relying on this information.

CarbonMeld is not a registry, certification body, or financial advisor. Scores reflect evidence available at the time of analysis and may change as new documentation becomes available. CarbonMeld shall not be liable for any decision to purchase, sell, trade, or otherwise transact carbon credits based in whole or in part on the scores or content of this report.

Report ID: CM-3942B0CC · Scoring Methodology: General v2.0 · Scored: 2026-04-02 · Generated: 2026-04-02

carbonmeld.com · carbonmeld.com/methodology · carbonmeld.com/editorial-policy